

# MISSING PAGE'S

*THROUGHOUT  
FOLDER*

REC Filed

January 16, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 271

ceeds to understate the conservatism by 100 percent.

The editorial states that the Kuchel resolution would permit 20 days of debate. The fact is that on any significant issue, the opposition can and will debate the motion to "take up" for 20 days under the pending resolution. If cloture is invoked, they would have another 20 days for a second marathon debate.

Anyone who calls this gag rule is being funny. They certainly are not being accurate in any sense.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Fighting the Filibuster" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**FIGHTING THE FILIBUSTER**

The most striking aspect of the anti-filibuster fight in the Senate is the extreme conservatism of the reforms offered. Senators McGovern and Morton are asking only that the number of Senators required to end debate be reduced from two-thirds to three-fifths, or, if all were present, from 67 to 60. Senators Kuchel and Clark would permit debate to be ended by a constitutional majority (51) regardless of how many members might be present and voting. And this cut-off could be invoked only after discussion of the issue had been in progress for 20 days or more.

The more liberal of these measures stops somewhat short of meeting the argument that any systematic frustration of majority action is unconstitutional. A rule that would permit the Senate to chew over every highly controversial issue for 20 days or more without restraint could be a potent source of obstruction. No doubt Senators Kuchel and Clark have made their resolution extremely lenient in the hope of establishing the principle of majority cloture. But in practice it would require substantial refinement before the Senate could be regarded as a modern legislative body.

We agree, however, with the view that the most important thing is to establish the principle of majority cloture. With that once recognized, the Senate would be free to bring about further changes by majority action wherever the need for it might arise.

The right of the majority to work its will in the Senate has become the foremost issue before that body. We think it ought to be decided this time before the Senate turns to other business. There is a strong hope that Vice President Humphrey will rule, when the right moment comes, that the Senate has a constitutional right to modify its rules by majority action in disregard of the odious Rule 22. The whole country has an interest in demanding that Mr. Humphrey stand by his convictions of the past on this issue and that the Senate sustain him.

Nothing is to be gained by further procrastination. The question is one of preparing the Senate to meet its broadened responsibilities in addition to reinstating the constitutional principle of majority rule. It is a principle worth fighting for, and those who are carrying the burden of the battle ought to have unflinching support until their objective has been won.

**WHY THE WASHINGTON POST OPPOSES THE TAX HIKE**

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Washington Post has published a series of some of the finest and most thoughtful editorials in the Nation in opposition to the proposed tax increases.

The Washington Post has been thoughtfully sympathetic to the President and to the so-called new economics.

It enthusiastically favors the use of fiscal policy—taxing and spending—to influence economic growth and retard inflation. Its voice on the tax increase deserves thoughtful attention.

Recently the Post published an editorial entitled "The Wrong Fiscal Path." This editorial makes the vital point that the tax increase will not achieve the end its proponents fervently want. They want lower interest rates. But interest rates are already beginning to move down and they can and will continue to move down if the Federal Reserve Board simply increases the money supply. Whether taxes are raised or lowered will have little effect.

What the Federal Reserve Board does will have the only significant effect on interest rates.

Proponents want a tax increase to save Great Society programs. The tax increase, as a matter of cruel political fact, is far more likely to kill such programs, as Members of Congress and the public recognize the price.

Finally, the tax increase could lead us to a recession, unemployment, an end to this long, happy period of economic growth.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial, entitled "The Wrong Fiscal Path," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**THE WRONG FISCAL PATH**

Some observers believe that President Johnson proposed the 6 per cent surcharge on income taxes in an effort to buy more monetary ease. Others lean toward the view that he wished to keep the administrative budget deficit below \$12.4 billion, the record established by the Eisenhower Administration in the fiscal year 1959. But whatever the motives, it is difficult to defend the Administration's proposal on either economic or political grounds. If the proposal has any virtue, it is the July 1 effective date which gives the Congress ample time to debate the issue in the light of economic developments that unfold during the course of this year.

The economic objection to the higher taxes is that the economy is exhibiting unmistakable signs of sluggishness and is more likely to require a fiscal stimulant than a sedative in the months ahead. On the day that the President delivered his message, it was announced that retail sales declined in December. There is a slump in the construction industry. Capital expenditures will not rise significantly in the first half of this year and are likely to decline in the second.

In view of these trends, the tightening of fiscal policy, by diminishing the stream of consumer expenditures and dampening business expectations, involves the very real risk of precipitating a deep recession. There is a widespread—and erroneous—belief that such a recession could not occur in the face of high defense expenditures. But defense expenditures—and more importantly, defense production—are leveling off.

There are those of the President's advisers who cling to the view that a tighter fiscal policy, however inappropriate, is the price that must be paid for a reversal of the Federal Reserve Board's monetary policy. In addition to viewing the Board as if it were somehow a sovereign power instead of a creature of the Congress, this view overlooks the fact that interest rates have already fallen as a consequence of the softening of

the demand for credit. And with the decision of the German Bundesbank to lower its discount rates and the prospect that other European central banks will follow there is no balance-of-payments reason why market force should not be permitted to lower rates on this country.

Professor J. Kenneth Galbraith and others who believe that the attainment of the highest good is predicated on shifts of resources from the private to the public sector of the economy, are supporting the surcharge. But they are blind to the dangers of tying specific programs to tax increases. Raising taxes to continue Great Society programs is a move hardly calculated to increase their popularity, and the difficulties will be compounded if the economy is also depressed in the process.

President Johnson said that he would soon send his specific proposals to the Congress and added that: "Yours is the responsibility to discuss and debate them—to approve or modify or reject them." Congress made a mistake by rushing through the suspension of the investment tax credit. There is no reason at all for haste on the income tax surcharge.

**JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON THE CHINESE ECONOMY**

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, dramatic and momentous events are occurring in China today, events that may not only shape history for many years in the Far East, but could have a most serious effect on our own military and foreign policy.

The Milwaukee Journal spelled out in an editorial yesterday how serious is the gap in our knowledge about developments in this immense Communist dictatorship.

This Government has a responsibility to the security of our country to find out all we can about China, not only about its attitudes and the tendencies of its political developments, but the more basic facts about its economy—what kind of potential threat or promise China really represents.

What limits does the Chinese economy really place on its military capacity, on its ability to help or hurt other nations in Asia and throughout the world?

Senator JAVITS suggested to the Joint Economic Committee last year that the committee should study and hold hearings on the Chinese economy.

The Javits suggestion made excellent sense. The Joint Economic Committee has made some of the very best and most authoritative studies of the Russian economy. They are highly prized among university experts as well as in Government.

Since Senator JAVITS made his suggestion last summer, the committee has been busily following up with a series of studies of the Chinese economy by the Nation's top experts. Those studies are now being printed. And hearings will begin before the Joint Economic Committee on the Chinese economy after hearings are held on the President's Economic Report.

What we learn about the Chinese economy should contribute greatly to our evaluation of our military and foreign policies throughout Asia, and, indeed, the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Sunday Milwaukee Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEWS COVERAGE OF CHINA

The news stories out of Communist China reported mostly from Hong Kong or Tokyo are blood chilling. The nation is apparently in a power struggle and in great turmoil. What is really happening? We don't accurately know. The sources of news are so limited and restricted that coverage is all but impossible.

Much of the news now comes from Red Guard posters displayed in the cities. These are political documents meant to serve political ends and cannot be accepted as factual. Many may not even be posted by the Red Guard but by their opponents.

At a recent meeting of the International Press Institute in India, news coverage of China was discussed in depth.

There are only 30 foreign correspondents in Peking and nearly half are from Communist countries. Nine represent Japan, four the west. None is from the United States. All are restricted to within 25 miles of the center of Peking. Their sources are confined to Peking newspapers, New China News reports and official publications. They may not buy any provincial publications not sold in Peking. They may not talk with Chinese on the streets. Their interpreters are supplied by the diplomatic service bureau, a government agency. There are almost no press briefings. When there are, the Chinese officials talk in a mixed jargon of Chinese obscurities and their brand of Marxism. Radio Peking broadcasts drab, unnewsworthy programs that tell little or nothing.

The basic fact is that, as an Israeli editor said, one does not cover China, one seeks to uncover it and with little success because the Chinese don't want outsiders peering around. The Chinese trust no one. The Chinese people get so little outside news that they know nothing of the world. What news there is has to be read between the lines for the most part. When the Communist coup in Indonesia was crushed there was no mention of it for almost two weeks in Chinese papers. Then the only indication that something had happened came in a letter reprinted in the press in which President Liu Shao-chi congratulated President Sukarno on his being in good health in spite of what has happened. Only later was the coup discussed.

The United States has almost no contact at all with China. Our nationals don't travel there, nor theirs here. We have no diplomatic contact save occasional meetings in Warsaw. It is indeed the "mysterious east." And the problem is all the more aggravating now when momentous things may be happening but no one knows for sure what they are or what they mean.

#### DICKEY CHAPELLE MEMORIAL DISPENSARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on November 4 the Dickey Chapelle Memorial Dispensary was dedicated in Vietnam. This dispensary is a most appropriate memorial to a native of Milwaukee who was a great war correspondent. She died as she lived, in a war zone on patrol with a group of Marines.

General Walt made an excellent speech at the dispensary dedication ceremonies highlighting the ingredients that made Dickey Chapelle a unique

human being, who brought great pride to my State of Wisconsin. Her uncompromising honesty as well as her great courage should be an inspiration to all who follow in her footsteps.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD so that Senators can better understand the sorrow Wisconsinites felt at the death of this unique woman.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. LEWIS W. WALT, USMC, CG, III MAF, DELIVERED AT DEDICATION OF DICKEY CHAPELLE MEMORIAL DISPENSARY, NOVEMBER 4, 1966

A year ago today, not far from here, the world lost a dedicated and professional combat correspondent—and American fighting men lost a true friend.

For more than twenty years, Dickey Chapelle could be found where the action was; Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Lebanon, Hungary, Cuba, Quemoy, India, Laos, the Dominican Republic, and finally South Viet Nam.

Mr. Jim Lucas has spoken this morning about Dickey Chapelle from his correspondent's point of view. She was a professional from any point of view—highly respected by her contemporaries, her readers, and by the men whom she accompanied into battle. The front lines was her beat.

It is difficult to say just when the mutual romance and respect between this reporter from Milwaukee and the American fighting man began. Perhaps it was aboard a hospital ship off Okinawa or on the black beaches of Iwo Jima. But wherever it had its start, it compelled her to travel the world over to be with our fighting men and to tell the story of what they were doing.

She wore baggy utilities—a jauntily set jungle hat—and a perpetual smile. She was half the size of the Marines she followed into combat, until she spoke; then suddenly she grew in stature, speaking with the authority of a combat veteran—which, of course, she was.

When this frail looking woman showed up on the front lines, tough veterans would shudder. Who was going to take care of her, they wondered.

"Forget that I'm a woman," she would say. "I'll lug my own stuff and ask no favors." And she was true to her word. She asked no quarters, and would have been offended had it been offered.

As General Krulak noted shortly after her death, "The Marines are a fraternity, and if a woman can belong to a fraternity, Dickey Chapelle managed to do it."

Never complaining, determined always to carry her share of the load, ever enthusiastic, she had the ability to convey the reality of war to film and paper in a degree seldom matched. She had a deep-seated feeling for people and events. She showed no fear and had a total disregard for her personal safety.

For twenty years her life was one of being with the fighting men and telling their story to the world.

It is most fitting that we here today dedicate this dispensary to her memory—the memory of a woman who loved people and hated the violence which causes hurt and pain and misery.

For this facility is, by its very nature, dedicated to overcoming the physical ravages of war and disease and pestilence.

Today marks a beginning—for this building is only the central portion of a dispensary that will eventually grow to encompass a 44-bed facility.

Built by the 9th Engineer Battalion, the dispensary will serve our Vietnamese friends, staffed by both Vietnamese and American medical personnel. It has been made possible by funds which have been provided

through GAEF and donated by friends of Dickey Chapelle.

Anyone who met Dickey Chapelle could not forget her. Her willingness to involve herself with the crises of our time showed a rare spirit. As a result, thousands of Americans at home lived closer to our men in Viet Nam and came to know the struggle for dignity and freedom of the Vietnamese people.

She had dinner at my quarters the day before she was killed. Several of my officers and myself had a wonderful evening listening to her tell of her many experiences with our Marines. As she left my quarters that evening, she mentioned she was going out on patrol the next day. I told her to keep her head down and not to take chances. She said, "When the time comes for me to go, I want it to be on a patrol with Marines." And that's the way it was.

And so we dedicate this building to the memory of Dickey Chapelle—combat correspondent, patriot, and humanitarian.

#### DEATH OF MRS. BESSIE STALEY CHEATHAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Saturday, one of the outstanding women of our times passed away—Mrs. Bessie Staley Cheatham. She died at the age of 86, as she was born on April 11, 1880.

It was almost 7 years ago, on April 11, 1960, when I made a statement on this floor calling the attention of the Senate to her 80th birthday that day. In observing that she was a grand lady well known and beloved to the Members of the U.S. Senate, I said that the shortest and best description that we could give her was the unofficial title of "the 101st Senator" for she had truly become one of the fixtures of the Senate.

For decades, Bessie Staley Cheatham was as constant in her attendance of the sessions of the U.S. Senate as was any of the Senators. She faithfully took her place in the Senate Gallery near the clock. She followed the debate ever so closely with her ever keenly analytical mind.

She was probably a better parliamentarian than most Members of the Senate. In fact, at times, fellow galleryites overheard her "quarterback" remarks intended for her favorite choice for President, and then Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson.

The Senate will not seem the same without the glowing presence of Bessie Staley Cheatham in the Senate Gallery. It has lost one of its most beloved fixtures with her passing. We have lost a good counselor and a loyal friend who constantly gave inspiration to us.

The church services in Washington will be held tomorrow morning at 11 at the All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church. The next day, the afternoon of Wednesday, January 18 at 2 o'clock, final rites will be conducted at the Suffolk Christian Church in Suffolk, Va., where her father was pastor for nearly 30 years. The service will be conducted by a minister, who assisted her father and was later pastor at that church.

Among her survivors is her son, William S. Cheatham, former administrative assistant to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Eight Senate doorkeepers will serve as honorary pallbearers.